arXiv:1201.2187v1 [gr-qc] 10 Jan 2012

A spin-foam vertex amplitude with the correct semiclassical limit

Jonathan Engle
Department of Physics, Florida Atlantic University, 777 Glades Road, Boca Raton, FL 33433, USA

Spin-foam models are hoped to provide a dynamics for loop quantum gravity. All 4-d spin-foam models of gravity start from the Plebanski formulation, in which gravity is recovered from a topological field theory, BF theory, by the imposition of constraints, which, however, select not only the gravitational sector, but also unphysical sectors. We show that this is the root cause for terms beyond the required Feynman-prescribed exponential of i times the action in the semiclassical limit of the EPRL spin-foam vertex. By quantizing a condition isolating the gravitational sector, we modify the EPRL vertex, yielding what we call the proper EPRL vertex amplitude. This provides at last a vertex amplitude for loop quantum gravity with the correct semiclassical limit.

Introduction Loop quantum gravity (LQG) [1–4] offers a compelling kinematical framework in which discreteness of geometry is *derived* from a quantization of general relativity (GR) rather than postulated. This discreteness has enabled well-defined proposals for the Hamiltonian constraint — defining the dynamics of the theory — in which one sees how diffeomorphism invariance eliminates normally problematic ultraviolet divergences. However, the lack of manifest space-time covariance, inherent in any canonical approach to gravity, is often suspected as a reason for the presence of ambiguities in the Hamiltonian constraint. This has motivated the *spin-foam* program [1, 5–7], which aims to provide a space-time covariant, path integral version of the dynamics of LQG. The histories summed over in the path integral are those arising from loop quantization methods.

The individual *amplitudes* in a spin-foam sum are derived using the *Plebanski* formulation of gravity, or variations thereof. In this formulation of gravity, one takes advantage of the fact that GR can be formulated as a *topological field theory* whose quantization is well-understood — BF theory [8] — supplemented by so-called *simplicity* constraints. Within the last few years, a spin-foam model of quantum gravity was, for the first time, introduced whose kinematics match those of LQG and therefore realize the original goal of the spin-foam program: to provide a path integral dyanamics for LQG. This is known in the literature as EPRL [9, 10]; when the Barbero-Immirzi parameter [11, 12] β, a certain quantization ambiguity, is less than 1, this model is equal to the Freidel-Krasnov model [13]. Despite its success, the EPRL vertex still has difficulty in obtaining the correct semiclassical limit: (non-geometric) degenerate configurations are not suppressed [14], and even if one restricts to non-degenerate configurations, the semiclassical limit of the vertex amplitude has four terms instead of the required one term of the form exponential of i times the action [14]. As we shall show in this letter, this difficulty is directly due to a problem with the way gravity is recovered from BF theory: When one imposes the simplicity constraints, one isolates not only the gravitational sector, but three sectors, and these sectors are directly responsible both for the extra terms present in the semiclassical limit, as well as the persistence of degenerate configurations. The other 4-d spin-foam models of gravity have similar problems with a similar source [15–17]. In the present work, we show how, by formulating the restriction to the gravitational sector classically first, quantizing it, and incorporating it into the EPRL vertex definition, one can define a modified vertex for which the extra terms are eliminated, degenerate configurations are exponentially suppressed, and one finally achieves a vertex with *the correct semiclassical limit*. This new modified vertex, which we call the proper EPRL vertex, additionally continues to be compatible with loop quantum gravity, linear in the boundary state, and $SU(2)$ invariant. The condition of linearity in the boundary state is necessary to ensure that the final transition amplitude defined by the spin-foam model is linear in the initial state and anti-linear in the final state.

At the end of the letter, we also remark upon a possible relation to Oriti's Feynman propagator [18], Teitelboim's causal propagator [19], as well as the positive frequency condition used in loop quantum cosmology [20].

To begin, we review the classical discrete framework, review the EPRL vertex, point out its problems, and then derive the solution, leading to the definition of the proper EPRL vertex. The present letter gives only a summary of this work, further details being left to the two papers [21, 22].

Review of EPRL and the problem with its asymptotics. The quantum histories used in spin-foam sums are usually based on a triangulation of space-time into 4-simplices. The probability amplitude for a given spin-foam history breaks up into a product of amplitudes associated to each component of the triangulation [1, 7]. The most important of these amplitudes is the *vertex amplitude*, which provides the probability amplitude for data associated to a single 4-simplex. In the following, as we are concerned specifically with the vertex amplitude, for conceptual clarity, we focus on a single 4-simplex σ. (Though the EPRL vertex has been generalized to arbitrary cells [23], we restrict ourselves to the simplicial case, as certain key arguments we use will depend on the combinatorics of this case. See remarks at the end of this letter.) Let triangles and tetrahedra of σ be denoted respectively by f and t and decorations thereof. Fix a transverse orientation of each f within the boundary of σ. For improved clarity and brevity we review here the definition of the basic variables in a way different from, but equivalent to, [21, 22]. Let us fix an affine structure on the 4-simplex σ; this is equivalent to fixing a flat connection ∂_a on σ. The basic variables for a single 4-simplex consist in 5 group elements $\{G_t\}_{t\in\sigma} \subset Spin(4)$, and 20 algebra elements $\{B^{IJ}_{tf}\} \subset \mathfrak{so}(4)$. These are subject to a number of constraints: (1.) 'orientation', $G_t \triangleright B_{ft} = -G_{t'} \triangleright B_{ft'}$, (2.) 'closure', $\sum_{f\in t} B_{ft} = 0$, and (3.) 'linear simplicity', $(\star B_{ft})^{0i} = 0$. Let (1.)' denote the part of constraint (1.) that is independent of the G_t variables ($B^{IJ}_{ft} B_{ftIJ} = B^{IJ}_{ft'} B_{ft'IJ}$, $\epsilon_{IJKL} B^{IJ}_{ft} B^{KL}_{ft} = \epsilon_{IJKL} B^{IJ}_{ft'} B^{KL}_{ft'}$). (1.)' and (3.) are imposed as a restriction on the allowed boundary data and histories integrated over in the vertex amplitude (see below). The rest of (1.) and (2.) are imposed in the sense that violations are exponentially suppressed by the vertex amplitude. Constraints (1.) and (2.) imply that there exists a *unique two-form* $B^{IJ}_{\mu\nu}$, constant with respect to ∂_a, such that, for all t, f with $f \in t$, [21, 24]

$$G_t \triangleright B^{IJ}_{ft} = \int_f B^{IJ}. \tag{1}$$

When the constraint (3.), linear simplicity, is additionally imposed, this two-form field $B^{IJ}_{\mu\nu}$ furthermore takes one of the three forms [21]

$$(II\pm) B^{IJ} = \pm\frac{1}{2}\epsilon^{IJ}{}_{KL} e^K \wedge e^L \text{ for some constant } e^I_\mu$$
$$(deg)\, \epsilon_{IJKL}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} B^{IJ}_{\mu\nu} B^{KL}_{\rho\sigma} = 0 \text{ (degenerate case)}$$

where the names for these sectors have been taken from [21, 25]. Only $(II+)$ yields a theory with both the correct gravitational degrees of freedom and the usual gravitational action with the usual sign [21, 25].

The boundary phase space giving rise to the $Spin(4)$ BF Hilbert space associated to the boundary of σ is parameterized by the five group elements $\{G_{t'_f t_f}\}_{f\in\sigma} \subset Spin(4)$ and the algebra elements $\{B^{IJ}_{ft}\}$, where t_f, t'_f are respectively the tetrahedron 'above' and 'below' f within the boundary of σ, and $G_{t't} := G^{-1}_{t'} G_t$. The Poisson bracket structure is such that the combination

$$J^{IJ}_{ft} := \frac{1}{8\pi G}\left(B_{ft} + \frac{1}{\gamma} \star B_{ft}\right)^{IJ} \tag{2}$$

generates left or right translations on $G_{t'_f t_f}$ according to whether t equals t'_f or t_f, respectively. The corresponding generators of (internal) spatial rotations are then $L^i_{ft} := \frac{1}{2}\epsilon^i{}_{jk} J^{jk}_{ft}$.

In quantum theory, the simplicity constraint reduces the boundary Hilbert space of the quantum BF theory to precisely that of LQG, yielding an embedding of LQG boundary states into $Spin(4)$ BF theory boundary states [10]. Let us recall this embedding both because it is at the heart of the EPRL vertex amplitude, and because it clarifies the interpretation of the LQG boundary states in terms of the discrete classical $Spin(4)$ BF theory reviewed above.

The LQG Hilbert space associated to $\partial\sigma$ is $L^2(\times_f SU(2))$. A (generalized) *spin-network* $\Psi_{\{k_f,\psi_{ft}\}}$ in this space is labeled by one spin k_f and two states $\psi_{ft'_f} \in V^*_f$, $\psi_{ft_f} \in V_f$ per triangle f, where V_k denotes the spin-k representation of $SU(2)$. $\Psi_{\{k_f,\psi_{ft}\}} \in L^2(\times_f SU(2))$ is given explicitly by

$$\Psi_{\{k_f,\psi_{ft}\}}(\{g_f\}) := \prod_f \langle \psi_{ft'_f} \rho_{k_f}(g_f) \psi_{ft_f} \rangle \tag{3}$$

where $\rho_k(g)$ denotes the representation matrix for $g \in SU(2)$ on V_k. The embedding $\iota : L^2(\times_f SU(2)) \to L^2(\times_f Spin(4))$ from LQG states to $Spin(4)$ BF theory boundary states is defined in terms of the (over complete) basis (3) by

$$(\iota\Psi_{\{k_f,\psi_{ft}\}})(\{G_f\}) := \prod_f \langle \psi_{ft'_f} | \iota^{k_f} \rho_{s^-_f, s^+_f}(G_f) \iota_{k_f} | \psi_{ft_f} \rangle \tag{4}$$

where here and throughout this letter we set $s^\pm := \frac{1}{2}|1 \pm \gamma|k$, $\rho_{s^-,s^+}(G)$ denotes the spin (s^-, s^+) representation of $G \in Spin(4)$, $\iota_k : V_k \to V_{s^-} \otimes V_{s^+}$ denotes the indicated intertwiner scaled such that it is isometric in the Hilbert space inner products, and $\iota^k : V_{j^-} \otimes V_{j^+} \to V_k$ is its hermitian conjugate.

In terms of the family of states (3), the operator $\hat{L}^i_{ft}$, the quantization of L^i_{ft} in the $Spin(4)$ quantum theory, acts directly on ψ_{ft} as can be checked:

$$\hat{L}^i_{ft} \iota \Psi_{\{k_{f'},\psi_{f't'}\}} = \iota \Psi_{\{k_{f'},\tilde{\psi}_{f't'}\}} \tag{5}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}_{ft} := \hat{L}^i \psi_{ft}$, and $\tilde{\psi}_{f't'} := \psi_{f't'}$ for $f' \neq f$ or $t \neq t'$, and where $\hat{L}^i$ denotes the $SU(2)$ generators acting in the appropriate irreducible representation, normalized such that $[\hat{L}^i, \hat{L}^j] = i\epsilon^{ij}_k \hat{L}^k$.

The *EPRL vertex amplitude* $A^{EPRL}_v : L^2(\times_f SU(2)) \to \mathbb{C}$, in terms of the above is

$$A^{EPRL}_v(\Psi_{\{k_f,\psi_{ft}\}}) := \int_{Spin(4)^5} \left(\prod_t dG_t\right) \left(\iota\Psi_{\{k_f,\psi_{ft}\}}\right) (G_{t'_f t_f})$$
$$= \int_{Spin(4)^5} \left(\prod_t dG_t\right) \prod_f \langle \psi_{ft'_f} | \iota^{k_f} \rho(G_{t'_f t_f}) \iota_{k_f} | \psi_{ft_f} \rangle. \tag{6}$$

The vertex amplitude can be rewritten using what we call *Livine-Speziale* coherent states [26]. Each such state $\Psi_{\{k_f,n_{ft}\}}$ is labeled by one spin k_f per f, and one unit 3-vector n_{ft} per f, t with $f \in t$, and are obtained from the states (3) by setting $\psi_{ft'_f} := \langle k_f, -n_{ft'_f}|$ and $\psi_{ft_f} := |k_f, n_{ft_f}\rangle$, where $|k, n\rangle \in V_k$ denotes the indicated $SU(2)$ *Perelomov* coherent state [27]. One then has

$$A^{LQG}_v(\Psi_{\{k_f,n_{ft}\}}) = \tag{7}$$
$$\int_{Spin(4)^5} \left(\prod_t dG_t\right) \prod_f \langle k_f, n_{ft'_f} | \iota^{k_f} \rho(G_{t'_f t_f}) \iota_{k_f} | k_f, n_{ft_f} \rangle$$

The $Spin(4)$ boundary state $\iota\Psi_{\{k_f,n_{ft}\}}$ represents a coherent state peaked on the classical configuration of B^{IJ}_{ft}'s taking the values

$$B^{IJ}_{ft} = 16\pi G k_f \delta^{[I}_0 n^{J]}_{ft} \tag{8}$$

where $n^0_{ft} := 0$. The B^{IJ}_{ft} values of the form (8) are the most general satisfying the constraints (1.)' and (3.) (linear simplicity) as enumerated earlier. Furthermore, the integral over the G_t's can be interpreted as a *path integral* over possible G_t's, which one identifies with the parallel transports introduced as part of the discrete classical framework reviewed above. This identification and interpretation of the group integration variables in (7) is justified by the asymptotic analysis of (7) carried out by Barrett et al. [14], in which one finds that the critical point equations for the group elements are precisely those satisfied by the parallel transports in the discrete classical framework.

If the data $\{k_f, n_{ft}\}$ satisfies $\sum_{f\in t} k_f n_{ft} = 0$ (closure) and is such that, for each t, the span of $\{n_{ft}\}_{f\in t}$ is three dimensional, then, for each t, one can construct a unique geometrical tetrahedron with face areas $A(k_f) := 8\pi\ell_P^2\gamma k_f$, and such that $n_{tf}\cdot n_{tf'} = -\cos\theta_{tff'}$ for all $f, f' \in t$, where $\theta_{tff'}$ denotes the interior angle between triangles f and f' within the geometrical tetrahedron for t. If these geometrical tetrahedra furthermore *fit together* to form a consistent geometrical 4-simplex, the data $\{k_f, n_{ft}\}$ is called *Regge-like.* and the overall phase of the coherent state $\Psi_{\{k_f,n_{ft}\}}$ can be fixed uniquely, giving rise to what is called the *Regge state* $\Psi^{\mathrm{R}}_{\{k_f,n_{ft}\}}$ [14]. For such states, the asymptotics of the EPRL vertex are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_v(\Psi^{\mathrm{R}}_{\{\lambda k_f,n_{ft}\}}) \sim \lambda^{-12}\big(&C_1 e^{iS_{\mathrm{R}}} + C_1 e^{-iS_{\mathrm{R}}} \\ &+ C_2 e^{\frac{i}{\gamma}S_{\mathrm{R}}} + C_3 e^{-\frac{i}{\gamma}S_{\mathrm{R}}}\big), \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $\sim$ indicates that the error term is bounded by a constant times the power of $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^+$ indicated, and where S_{R} denotes the Regge action determined by the data $\{\lambda k_f, n_{ft}\}$. To be noted is the presence in the asymptotics of not just the Feynman-prescribed exponential of i times the action, but of 3 extra terms which spoil the usual proof of the correct classical limit. This is in addition to the problem of the existence of a class of degenerate configurations yielding asymptotics that persist as strongly as those of the Regge-like configurations in (9). The asymptotics for this class of degenerate configurations have not been shown here, but can be found in [14]. It turns out that the existence of these non-suppressed degenerate configurations, as well as of the extra terms in the asymptotics (9), is *precisely* due to the fact that linear simplicity allows for more than the usual gravitational sector (II+) as was shown in [21].

A condition selecting the gravitational sector and its quantization. To solve the above problem, our strategy is first to find a classical condition on the basic variables that selects the $(II+)$ sector, quantize this condition, and then use it to modify the EPRL vertex (6, 7). For each two tetrahedra t, t' define the sign $\beta_{tt'}(\{G_{\tilde{t}\tilde{t}'}\})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{tt'}(\{G_{\tilde{t}\tilde{t}'}\}) := -\mathrm{sgn}\big[&\epsilon_{ijk}(G_{tt_1})^i{}_0(G_{tt_2})^j{}_0(G_{tt_3})^k{}_0\cdot \\ &\cdot\epsilon_{lmn}(G_{t't_1})^l{}_0(G_{t't_2})^m{}_0(G_{t't_3})^n{}_0\big] \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $G^I{}_J$ denotes the $SO(4)$ matrix canonically associated to a given $Spin(4)$ element G (see, e.g., [14, 22]), t_1, t_2, t_3 are the tetrahedra *other* than t, t', in any order, and sgn is defined to be zero when its argument is zero. We then have the result that the constant 2-form $B^{IJ}_{\mu\nu}$ determined by equation (1) is in sector $(II+)$ iff

$$\beta_{tt'}(\{G_{\tilde{t}\tilde{t}'}\})\cdot(G_t)^i{}_0\cdot(L_{ft})_i > 0 \tag{11}$$

for *some* pair of tetrahedra t, t', where $f = t\cap t'$ [22]. This is the condition which we seek to quantize and use to modify the vertex integral (6, 7). Normally this would be done by inserting into the path integral (7) the Heaviside function

$$\Theta\left(\beta_{tt'}(\{G_{\tilde{t}\tilde{t}'}\})\cdot(G_t)^i{}_0\cdot(L_{ft})_i\right), \tag{12}$$

where $\Theta(\cdot)$ is zero when its argument is zero. However, if one inserts this into (7), one obtains a vertex amplitude which is *non-linear in the boundary state*, spoiling the property of the final spin-foam sum that it be linear in the initial state and anti-linear in the final state (a property necessary for the final spin-foam sum to be interpreted as a transition amplitude). Instead, we *partially quantize* the expression (12) before inserting it into (6), by replacing L^i_{ft} with $SU(2)$ generators $\hat{L}^i$ acting on the coherent state $|k_f, n_{ft}\rangle$. Because the generators $\hat{L}^i$ are peaked on $L^i_{ft} = j_f n^i_{ft}$ when acting on the Perelomov coherent state $|k_f, n_{ft}\rangle$, such insertions will still impose the desired condition (11) in the semiclassical limit, and so remove the unwanted 'non-gravitational' sectors, while at the same time preserving the necessary linearity in the boundary state. Thus we insert the following group-variable dependent operator on V_{k_f}:

$$\hat{P}_{t't}(\{G_{\tilde{t}'\tilde{t}}\}) := P_{(0,\infty)}\left(\beta_{t't}(\{G_{\tilde{t}'\tilde{t}}\})\cdot(G_t)^i{}_0\cdot\hat{L}_i\right) \tag{13}$$

where $P_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{O})$ denotes the spectral projector for the operator $\hat{O}$ onto the portion $\mathcal{S}$ of its spectrum. Inserting this into the vertex path integral (6), one obtains what we call the *proper EPRL vertex amplitude.* For a *general* $SU(2)$ spin-network state (3), it is explicitly given by

$$\begin{aligned} &A^{(II+)}_v(\Psi_{\{k_f,\psi_{ft}\}}) = \qquad\qquad (14) \\ &\int\limits_{Spin(4)^5}\Big(\prod_t dG_t\Big)\prod_f\langle\psi_{ft'_f}|\iota^{k_f}\rho(G_{t'_f t_f})\iota_{k_f}\hat{P}_{t'_f t_f}(\{G_{t'_f t_f}\})|\psi_{ft_f}\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

One can equivalently write the vertex amplitude with the projector on the left side of each integrand factor [22]. This vertex amplitude is manifestly linear in the boundary state (3), and one can furthermore show that it is

$SU(2)$ invariant [22]. For the coherent state $\Psi_{\{\lambda k_f, n_{ft}\}}$, for large λ, the proper EPRL vertex is exponentially suppressed unless $\{k_f, n_{ft}\}$ describes a non-degenerate Regge geometry, in which case it now has *precisely the required asymptotics* [22]

$$A_v^{(II+)}(\Psi^{\mathrm{R}}_{\{\lambda k_f, n_{ft}\}}) \sim \lambda^{-12} e^{iS_{\mathrm{R}}}. \tag{15}$$

Discussion. By implementing quantum mechanically a restriction to Plebanski sector (II+), the EPRL vertex amplitude has been modified, yielding what we call the proper EPRL vertex. The resulting vertex is linear in the boundary state, $SU(2)$ invariant, and possesses the correct semiclassical limit.

Let us remark first on the non-triviality of the removal of the degenerate sector that has been achieved. In the work [17], the degenerate sector of the Freidel-Krasnov model (equal to EPRL for $\gamma < 1$) is removed by using a path integral representation based on coherent states, similar to the path integral representation of the EPRL vertex given in (7) above. However, in the conclusions of the work [17], the authors state that they do not know how rewrite the resulting restricted path integral as a spin-foam sum — that is, as a sum over histories of spin-foams labeled with spins and intertwiners, similar to (6). The reason for this difficulty arguably can be traced to the same reason for our rejection of the "naive" prescription of inserting the non-quantized Heaviside function (12) into (7): because the resulting transition amplitude is non-linear in the boundary state. Thus, as far as removal of the degenerate sector is concerned, the new element of the present work is precisely the fact that the removal is achieved in such a way that *linearity in the boundary state is preserved*, so that the vertex amplitude can continue to be used to define transition amplitudes between canonical states in the usual sense.

Beyond the removal of the degenerate sector, the proper vertex also achieves the removal of Plebanski sector (II-). The importance of this lay first and foremost in the need to include only *one* copy of the gravitational sector, with the usual sign in the action. However, the removal of sector (II-) also has a tantalizing similarity to a selection of a single orientation of the space-time manifold. If one could make this precise, one could potentially show that the restriction to (II+) achieved in the proper vertex is in fact conceptually the same as the restriction advocated by Oriti [18], and hence closely related to the causal propagator of Teitelboim [19], which from the symmetry reduced model analysis [28, 29], has been argued to be necessary for spin-foam models to be consistent with loop quantum cosmology [20, 30].

Two final open issues that remain are the generalization to the Lorentzian signature and the generalization to an arbitrary cell [23]. The generalization to the Lorentzian signature is expected to be straightforward. The generalization to an arbitrary cell, on the other hand, will likely require one to understand the strategy from an entirely new perspective, as the combinatorics of the 4-simplex are used in a key way not only in the derivation of the proper vertex, but in its very definition.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank Abhay Ashtekar, Chris Beetle, Frank Hellmann, and Carlo Rovelli for helpful exchanges.

---

[1] Rovelli, C. *Quantum Gravity.* Cambridge UP, Cambridge, (2004).

[2] Ashtekar, A. and Lewandowski, J. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21** (2004).

[3] Thiemann, T. *Modern Canonical Quantum General Relativity.* Cambridge UP, Cambridge, (2007).

[4] Rovelli, C. *arXiv:1102.3660* (2011).

[5] Reisenberger, M. P. *arXiv:gr-qc/9412035* (1994).

[6] Reisenberger, M. and Rovelli, C. *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 3490–3508 (1997).

[7] Perez, A. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20**, R43 (2003).

[8] Ooguri, H. *Mod.Phys.Lett.* **A7**, 2799–2810 (1992).

[9] Engle, J., Pereira, R., and Rovelli, C. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 161301 (2007).

[10] Engle, J., Livine, E., Pereira, R., and Rovelli, C. *Nucl. Phys. B* **799**, 136–149 (2008).

[11] Barbero G, J. F. *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 5507–5510 (1995).

[12] Immirzi, G. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **14**, L177–L181 (1995).

[13] Freidel, L. and Krasnov, K. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **25**, 125018 (2008).

[14] Barrett, J., Dowdall, R., Fairbairn, W., Gomes, H., and Hellmann, F. *J. Math. Phys.* **50**, 112504 (2009).

[15] Barrett, J., Dowdall, R., Fairbairn, W., Hellmann, F., and Pereira, R. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, 165009 (2010).

[16] Barrett, J. W. and Steele, C. M. *Class.Quant.Grav.* **20**, 1341–1362 (2003).

[17] Conrady, F. and Freidel, L. *Phys. Rev.* **D78**, 104023 (2008).

[18] Oriti, D. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 111301 (2005).

[19] Teitelboim, C. *Phys.Rev.* **D25**, 3159 (1982).

[20] Ashtekar, A., Pawlowski, T., and Singh, P. *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 084003 (2006).

[21] Engle, J. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **28**, 225003 (2011).

[22] Engle, J. *arXiv:1111.2865* (2011).

[23] Kamiński, W., Kisielowski, M., and Lewandowski, J. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, 095006 (2010).

[24] Barrett, J., Fairbairn, W., and Hellmann, F. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **25**, 2897–2916 (2010).

[25] Buffenoir, E., Henneaux, M., Noui, K., and Roche, P. *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21**, 5203–5220 (2004).

[26] Livine, E. and Speziale, S. *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 084028 (2007).

[27] Perelomov, A. *Commun.Math.Phys.* **26**, 222–236 (1972).

[28] Ashtekar, A., Campiglia, M., and Henderson, A. *Phys.Lett.* **B681**, 347–352 (2009).

[29] Ashtekar, A., Campiglia, M., and Henderson, A. *Class.Quant.Grav.* **27**, 135020 (2010).

[30] Ashtekar, A., Pawlowski, T., and Singh, P. *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 124038 (2006).